REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14 16-20, 23-26, 38, and 41 are pending and stand rejected. In response, claims 1-5, 10-12, 16-18, 23, 38, and 41 are amended, claims 8, 13-14, and 26 are canceled, and claim 54 is added. Support for the amendments and new claim is found throughout the specification, including, for example, at paragraphs 40, 43, 44, 48, 51, 56, and 64.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-12, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,924) in view of Tervo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,907,577). Claims 4 and 10 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Yee, Tervo, and further in view of Cason et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,410,957). Claims 13 and 38 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Tervo in view of Tada et al. (U.S. PGPub No. 2004/00041112). Claim 14 stands rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Tervo in view of Tada and further in view of Yee. Claims 16, 19-20, 23-25, and 41 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Jade et al. (U.S. PGPub. No. 2003/0001854). Claims 17-18 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Jade in view of Tada and further in view of Yee.

Claims 1-4, 5-8, 10-14, 26, and 38 are rejected under various combinations of Yee, Tervo, Cason, and Tada. These rejections are discussed together for clarity. Claim 1, as amended, recites analyzing actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred:

> receiving, with the capture processor, a plurality of keystrokes
> associated with the application;

24207/10069/SF/5270501.1

> processing, with the capture processor, each keystroke to determine an
> associated action in the application, the plurality of keystrokes
> forming a plurality of associated actions;
> **analyzing**, with the capture processor, the plurality of associated
> actions **to determine whether a complete event has occurred
> in the application**;…

For example, the plurality of associated actions can include characters being typed into a word processing application, and the complete event can be a complete word being entered into the application. *See e.g.* Specification, paragraph 56.

The cited references, whether considered individually or in the various combinations proposed by the Examiner, fail to disclose or suggest analyzing a plurality of associated actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred. Yee describes a recorder for recording keyboard inputs to a computer system. The recorder is inline between the output port of a keyboard and the keyboard input port of a computer system. The recorder intercepts and stores keyboard inputs and sends the inputs to the computer system's keyboard port. *See* Yee, Abstract and Figure 2. In rejecting the previous version of claim 1, the Examiner states that Yee discloses determining an event that has occurred based at least in part on a plurality of associated actions at col. 9 and Fig. 6C where Yee illustrates the recording and playback of keystrokes and mouse actions. However, Yee records each keystroke and mouse action individually and does not teach or suggest analyzing a plurality of associated actions to determine whether a complete event occurred.

Tervo discloses a way by which a user can use a single keystroke to place a computer cursor in a desired field or execute a function on a screen of an application. A given keystroke can have a different function or location on different screens. Tervo's

disclosure repeatedly emphasizes that it moves the cursor or executes the function based on a single keystroke. *See* Title ("…using a simple single key stroke), Abstract ("…by selecting a single keystroke…," col. 2, line 4, and col. 6, line 15. If a keystroke is considered an action, then Tervo at most discloses analyzing a single action. Thus, at the least Tervo does not disclose or suggest analyzing a plurality of associated actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred.

Cason describes a keystroke queuing system that receives keystrokes from a computer user. The system compares the keystrokes to a table to determine if they are valid typematic keystrokes. Cason, however, does not teach or disclose analyzing a plurality of associated actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred. Tada discloses way to store and manage electronic mail but does not disclose analyzing a plurality of associated actions in the manner claimed.

Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering the teachings of Yee, Tervo, Cason, and Tada would not find claim 1 obvious since none of the references disclose analyzing a plurality of associated actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred. Claims 2-4, 5-8, 10-14, 26, and 38 are not obvious for at least the same reasons.

Moreover, claim 3 is amended to recite that a complete event occurs responsive to the plurality of associated actions indicating that a complete word has been entered into the application." Claim 4 recites that the analysis "determines that a complete word has been entered responsive to the plurality of associated actions indicating a space or punctuation symbol has been entered." Additionally, new claim 54 recites that the analyzing "determines that a complete event has occurred responsive to the plurality of

24207/10069/SF/5270501.1

associated actions indicating that a predetermined number of words have been typed into the application."

In rejecting the previous version of claim 3, the Examiner states that Yee teaches that the event is a number of words typed at col. 4, lines 39-43. This portion describes how one can use Yee's system to record the keystrokes and mouse actions needed to take the user to a data entry point of an application such as a word processing application. It does not disclose that associated actions form a word, or determining a number of words typed.

In rejecting previous claim 4, the Examiner states that Cason teaches determining words by receipt of at least one keystroke indicating a space or punctuation mark at col. 3, lines 38-39. This portion states that only certain keys are typically typematic, including the space bar, backspace, and carrier return. Neither col. 3 nor the remainder of Cason teaches determining whether a word has been typed.

Claims 16, 17-20, 23-25, and 41 stand rejected based on various combinations of Jade, Tada, and Yee and are discussed together for clarity. Claim 16, as amended, recites analyzing display calls to determine a display produced by an application and analyzing the display to determine whether a complete event has occurred in the application:

> receiving, with the capture processor, a plurality of display calls
>   associated with the application;
> processing, with the capture processor, the plurality of display calls to
>   determine a display produced by the application;
> **analyzing**, with the capture processor, the display produced by the
>   application **to determine whether a complete event has
>   occurred in the application**;...

Neither Jade nor the other references disclose or suggest analyzing a display to determine whether a complete event has occurred.

24207/10069/SF/5270501.1

Jade describes a mechanism for capturing one or more graphics primitives drawn to a user interface by an executing application. In applying this reference against the previous version of claim 16, the Examiner states that Jade discloses determining an event that has occurred at paragraph 34. This paragraph describes how a target application spawns a dialog box having user option buttons as a result of an invoked action. Paragraph 37 additionally describes how Jade's mechanism intercepts system messages to detect actions such as the pressing of a function key or click of a mouse. However, Jade intercepts these messages in order to capture graphics primitives including font and context information. Jade, paragraph 40. Jade does not disclose analyzing the detected actions to determine whether a complete event has occurred as recited in claim 16.

Tada and Yee also do not disclose or suggest the claimed analyzing for the reasons described above. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering the teachings of Jade, Tada, and Yee would not find claim 16 obvious since none of the references disclose analyzing a display to determine whether a complete event has occurred. Claims 17-20, 23-25, and 41 are not obvious for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants request that the rejections of the pending claims be withdrawn and the application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 27, 2009   By: /Brian Hoffman/
                                           Brian Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
                                           Attorney for Applicants
                                           Fenwick & West LLP
                                           555 California Street
                                           San Francisco, CA 94104
                                           Tel.: (415) 875-2484
                                           Fax: (415) 281-1350